

Interview Summary/Substance

Applicant appreciates the courtesy of a telephone interview on March 22, 2010 between Examiner Douglas S. Lee and the undersigned.

The undersigned questioned how Lindstrom was being applied to the claims. The undersigned specifically questioned what the Office was identifying as the respective minimum and maximum distance values in claim 1. The examiner indicated that the wording was believed very broad and read upon Lindstrom but did not further elaborate. The undersigned questioned what additional amendments might be regarded as sufficiently narrowing to distinguish and identified the possibility of referencing different non-zero maximum and minimum values or identifying that the maximum value was associated with less than a full retraction. The examiner queried why this was useful and how the tool would operate. The undersigned indicated that the distance provides a safety cushion relative to objects such as a hand but, by not retracting to a full retraction can provide cycle efficiency. The examiner indicated that any amendments in that regard would require further consideration via an RCE. No agreement was reached.